

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 and 5-21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 15 and 19 have been amended and claim 21 has been added. Claims 1, 10 and 19 are independent. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Amendment

Support for the amendment to claims 1, 6, 10, 15 and 19 can be found in the specification at, for example, paragraphs [0020], [0027] and [0041] and Fig. 2. Support for new claim 21 can be found in the specification at, for example, paragraph [0017]. Claim 8 has been amended for clarification purposes. No new matter is added.

II. Interview

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners Liu and Bhatia in the December 23, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 8 has been amended to obviate the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8, 10-17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,584,466 to Serbinis et al. (Serbinis); and rejects claims 9 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Serbinis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,330,689 to Jin et al. (Jin). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, " at least two workflow modules automatically producing one or more documents that are published to one or more of the document repositories without user intervention." Independent claims 10 and 19 recite similar subject

matter. The applied references fail to teach or suggest the recited features of independent claims 1, 10 and 19.

As discussed and acknowledged during the December 23, 2008 personal interview, the applied references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest that at least two workflow modules automatically produce one or more documents that are published to one or more of the document repositories without user intervention.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a DNDS for "using the subject refinement data to refine subjects in a subject directory for representing subjects of the plurality of documents in the plurality of document repositories based on subject matter of content of the documents" and independent claims 10 and 19 recite, *inter alia*, "detecting documents pertaining to subjects of interest based on subject matter of content of the documents that are stored in the document repositories with a document notification and delivery service (DNDS)." The applied references fail to teach or suggest the recited features of independent claims 1, 10 and 19.

As discussed and acknowledged during the December 23, 2008 personal interview, the applied references fail to teach or suggest a DNDS for using subject refinement data to refine subjects in a subject directory for representing subjects of the plurality of documents in the plurality of document repositories based on subject matter of content of the documents. Thus, the applied references fail to teach or suggest the recited features of independent claims 1, 10 and 19.

As discussed and acknowledged during the December 23, 2008 personal interview, the applied references fail to teach or suggest that "the highly rated documents having been requested for delivery by at least a minimum number of predetermined users" as recited in dependent claims 6 and 15.

The dependent claims are at least allowable due to their dependence on allowable independent claims 1, 10 and 19 and for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims is respectfully requested.

V. New Claim 21 is Patentable

New claim 21 is added. New claim 21 is patentable at least due to its dependence on allowable independent claim 1 and for the additional features it recites.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3 and 5-21 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Obert H. Chu
Registration No. 52,744

JAO:OHC/mkg

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: January 2, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037
--